UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA INDIANAPOLIS DIVISION

STEVEN W. PRITT,)
Plaintiff,)
v.) No. 1:17-cv-02664-JPH-MPB
CORRECT CARE SOLUTIONS, et al.,)
Defendants.	<i>)</i>)

ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION

Plaintiff Steven Pritt, an Indiana inmate, was transferred from the New Castle Correctional Facility to the Marion County Jail several times between December of 2015 and February 2017. He brought this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging that he received inadequate medical care for his heart condition and mental health issues while he was confined at the Jail. He sued the private contractor that provides medical services at the Jail and several individual medical providers. The defendants moved for summary judgment and the Court granted the motion in part and denied it in part. Dkt. 123. The Court denied the motion as to defendant Nurse Carter, who interacted with Mr. Pritt in December 2015 and February 2017. *Id.* p. 19. The Court explained that because Mr. Pritt told Nurse Carter on December 15, 2015, that he was not receiving his medication and Nurse Carter did nothing to help him, a reasonable jury might conclude that Nurse Carter was deliberately indifferent to Mr. Pritt's serious medical needs in violation of his Eighth Amendment rights. *Id.* Nurse Carter seeks clarification of this order regarding his interaction with Mr. Pritt in February of 2017. Mr. Pritt has not responded to the motion.

There is no dispute of fact regarding whether Nurse Carter was deliberately indifferent to Mr. Pritt's serious medical needs in February of 2017. On February 16, 2017, Nurse Carter

conducted Mr. Pritt's intake screening. Dkt. 96-5 at 2 (¶ 6); dkt. 96-1 at 65-70. Mr. Pritt claims he

told Nurse Carter what medications he was taking, and that Nurse Carter looked at the medications

he brought with him. Dkt. 114 at 16 (¶ 2). Nurse Carter denies this occurred and claims Mr. Pritt

denied that he was taking any medications. Dkt. 96-5 at 2 (¶ 6). But it is undisputed that Nurse

Carter referred Mr. Pritt to the medical provider for consideration of whether he needed medication

and to mental health staff based on his answers to the mental health questions and that the provider

prescribed Mr. Pritt's medications the next day. Id. (¶ 6, 8). Nurse Carter also cleared Mr. Pritt

for segregation by confirming there was no medical issue that prevented him from being placed in

segregation. Id. at 3 (\P 7). Based on these facts, even when considered in the light most favorable

to Mr. Pritt, no reasonable jury could find that Nurse Carter was aware of a serious risk to Mr. Pritt

but disregarded it. See Petties v. Carter, 836 F.3d 722, 728 (7th Cir. 2016). While courts "look at

the totality of an inmate's medical care when considering whether that care evidences deliberate

indifference to serious medical needs," id., because Nurse Carter's December 2015 interaction with

Mr. Pritt was separated in time by over a year with the February 2017 interaction, these interactions

are properly considered separately.

No reasonable jury could conclude that Nurse Carter acted with deliberate indifference to

Mr. Pritt's medical needs in February 2017. Accordingly, the motion for clarification, dkt. [127],

is **GRANTED** consistent with this Order.

SO ORDERED.

Date: 7/20/2020

James Patrick Hanlon

United States District Judge

James Patrick Hanlon

Southern District of Indiana

2

Distribution:

STEVEN W. PRITT
196024
NEW CASTLE - CF
NEW CASTLE CORRECTIONAL FACILITY - Inmate Mail/Parcels
1000 Van Nuys Road
NEW CASTLE, IN 47362

All Electronically Registered Counsel